ENTERED

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS MCALLEN DIVISION

February 13, 2019
David J. Bradlev, Clerk

MICAH GARY JOEL ROLPH	§
	§
	§
VS.	§ MISC. ACTION NO. 7:18-MC-00598
	§
ARTURO GUAJARDO	§

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Before the Court is Plaintiff's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* and proposed 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint, which had been referred to the Magistrate Court for a report and recommendation. On January 18, 2019, the Magistrate Court issued the Report and Recommendation, recommending that the motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* with respect to this action, No. 7:18-MC-598, be **DENIED** as moot, and that the Clerk of the Court be directed to close the instant case and **CONSOLIDATE** it with Case No. 7:18-MC-579, using Case No. 7:18-MC-579 as the lead case. The time for filing objections has passed and no objections have been filed.

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b), the Court has reviewed the Report and Recommendation for clear error. Finding no clear error, the Court adopts the Report and Recommendation in its entirety. Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* with respect to this action, No. 7:18-MC-598, is **DENIED** as moot. The Clerk of the Court is directed to close Case No. 7:18-MC-598 and **CONSOLIDATE** it with Case No. 7:18-MC-579, with Case No. 7:18-MC-579 as the lead case. A copy of this order shall also be entered in Case No. 7:18-MC-579.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DONE at McAllen, Texas, this 13th day of February, 2019.

Micaela Alvarez
United States District Judge

¹ As noted by the Fifth Circuit, "[t]he advisory committee's note to Rule 72(b) states that, '[w]hen no timely objection is filed, the [district] court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation." Douglas v. United States Service Auto. Ass'n, 79 F.3d 145, 1420 (5th Cir. 1996) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) advisory committee's note (1983)) superceded by statute on other grounds by 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), as stated in ACS Recovery Servs., Inc. v. Griffin, No. 11-40446, 2012 WL 1071216, at *7 n. 5 (5th Cir. April 2, 2012).